UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,444	01/12/2004	Balaji Vembu	042390.P18507	2132
45209 INTEL/BLAKE	7590 06/23/200 ELY	8	EXAMINER	
1279 OAKMEA	AD PARKWAY	PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY		
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/756,444	VEMBU, BALAJI		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Venkat Perungavoor	2132		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 M</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,6-12 and 14-21 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12, 14-21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the defendance of a drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/6/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/6/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant makes one argument that the TPM being separate from the application program and graphics device distinguishes from cited prior arts.

Hillier discloses the 3rd Party Processor being separate from the orig. processor or recipient processor see Fig. 1.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5,7-13, 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 7142676 to Hillier et al.(hereinafter Hillier) in view of US Patent 6336121 to

Lyson et al.(hereinafter Lyson) further in view of US Patent 6256733 to Thakkar et al.(hereinafter Thakkar) and further in view US Patent 2004/0151319 to Proudler.

Regarding Claim 1, 10, Hillier discloses the first entity(originator processor) having associated with a key(KS1), second entity(recipient processor) associated with a key(2ndEPuK) and third entity(third party processor) associated with a key(3rdEPuk) being separate from first entity and second entity see Fig. 1 & Col 5 Ln 41- Col 6 Ln 13; decrypting of keys(KS2, KS, KS1) using third party's private keys see Col 6 Ln 3-13 & Col 7 Ln 5-20. But fails to explicitly disclose the encrypting the first key by the second key and another entity obtaining this key and further decrypting the first key encrypted by second key. However, Lyson discloses the re-encrypting the captured data and further of a requesting entity decrypting the encrypted key to obtain key see Fig. 3 item 70, 72, 74 & Col 5 Ln 40-51 & Col 6 Ln 19-23. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the re-encrypting of captured data and decrypting to obtain key in the invention of Hillier in order to have a reduced number of keys as taught in Lyson see Col 2 Ln 39-44. Neither Hillier nor Lyson explicitly disclose the encrypting of keys using the public key of an entity. However, Thakkar discloses the encrypting of keys using the public key see Col 1 Ln 37-53. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the use of encrypting key using public keys in the invention of Hillier in order to provide for signature verification using publicly available data as taught in Thakkar see Col 1 Ln 36-46. Neither Hillier nor Lyson nor Thakkar disclose the TPM.

Art Unit: 2132

However, Proudler discloses the TPM as being an entity that is used for encrypting using key see Fig. 3 item 10. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include TPM in the invention of Hillier in order to perform the encrypting operation in a TCPA specified chip as taught in Proudler see Par. 0003.

Page 4

Regarding Claim 2, 16, Hillier discloses direct communication between originator and recipient after connection see Col 4 Ln 23-27.

Regarding Claim 3-4, 11-12, Hillier discloses the processor, which includes an graphics device and application program see Fig. 1 item 12, 14.

Regarding Claim 5, 13, Hillier discloses the trust third party see Col 2 Ln 16-20.

Claims 6, 14-15, 17, 20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 7142676 to Hillier et al.(hereinafter Hillier) in view of US Patent 6336121 to Lyson et al.(hereinafter Lyson) further in view of US Patent 2003/0194093 to Evans et al.(hereinafter Evans).

Regarding Claim 6, 15, Hillier nor Lyson explicitly disclose the pseudo-randomly generated keys. However, Evans discloses the pseudo-randomly generated keys see Par. 0067. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2132

invention to include the pseudo-randomly generated keys in the invention of Hillier in order to have key that is never revealed as taught in Evans see Par. 0067 & Par. 0068.

Regarding Claim 14, 17, 20, Hillier nor Lyson explicitly disclose registers for storing keys or input/output pin dedicated to use by first entity. However, Evans discloses the registers for storing keys see Par. 0028 and input/output pin dedicated to use by first entity see Par. 0031 & Par. 0029. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include registers in the invention of Hiller in order to have a unit for storing keys as taught in Evans see Par. 0029.

Claims 18-19, 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 7142676 to Hillier et al.(hereinafter Hillier) in view of US Patent 6336121 to Lyson et al.(hereinafter Lyson) further in view of US Patent 6256733 to Thakkar et al.(hereinafter Thakkar) further in view of US Patent 2003/0194093 to Evans et al.(hereinafter Evans) and further in view of US Patent 2004/0151319 to Proudler.

Regarding Claim 18, Hillier discloses the first entity(originator processor) having associated with a key(KS1), second entity(recipient processor) associated with a key(2ndEPuK) and third entity(third party processor) associated with a key(3rdEPuk) being separate from first and second entity see Fig. 1 & Col 5 Ln 41- Col 6 Ln 13; decrypting of keys(KS2, KS, KS1) using third party's private keys see Col 6 Ln 3-13 & Col 7 Ln 5-20. But fails to explicitly disclose the encrypting the first key by the second

key and another entity obtaining this key and further decrypting the first key encrypted by second key. However, Lyson discloses the re-encrypting the captured data and further of a requesting entity decrypting the encrypted key to obtain key see Fig. 3 item 70, 72, 74 & Col 5 Ln 40-51 & Col 6 Ln 19-23. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the re-encrypting of captured data and decrypting to obtain key in the invention of Hillier in order to have a reduced number of keys as taught in Lyson see Col 2 Ln 39-44. Neither Hillier nor Lyson explicitly disclose the encrypting of keys using the public key of an entity. However, Thakkar discloses the encrypting of keys using the public key see Col 1 Ln 37-53. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the use of encrypting key using public keys in the invention of Hillier in order to provide for signature verification using publicly available data as taught in Thakkar see Col 1 Ln 36-46. Further yet, Hillier nor Lyson nor Thakkar explicitly disclose the pseudo-randomly generated keys. However, Evans discloses the pseudorandomly generated keys see Par. 0067. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the pseudo-randomly generated keys in the invention of Hillier in order to have key that is never revealed as taught in Evans see Par. 0067 & Par. 0068. Further, Hillier nor Lyson explicitly disclose registers for storing keys or input/output pin dedicated to use by first entity. However, Evans discloses the registers for storing keys see Par. 0028 and input/output pin dedicated to use by first entity see Par. 0031 & Par. 0029. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include registers in the invention of Hiller in order to

Page 6

Art Unit: 2132

have a unit for storing keys as taught in Evans see Par. 0029. Neither Hillier nor Lyson nor Thakkar disclose the TPM. However, Proudler discloses the TPM as being an entity that is used for encrypting using key see Fig. 3 item 10. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include TPM in the invention of Hillier in order to perform the encrypting operation in a TCPA specified chip as taught in Proudler see Par. 0003.

Regarding Claim 19, Hillier discloses the signal the start of key exchange see Fig. 3a item 42.

Regarding Claim 21, Hillier discloses the decrypting the encrypted content see Fig. 4 item 55.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkat Perungavoor whose telephone number is (571)272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/756,444 Page 8

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V. P./ Examiner, Art Unit 2132 June 16, 2008

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132